

July 7, 1969

be no surprise to discerning legislators, who know that improved library service is essential to the expansion of knowledge necessary to the improvement of health care in the United States. And for the nursing profession to plead for greater attention in the new legislation to nurses' needs for library service may also be thought inevitable.

You may be less prepared, however, for our expression of concern that the present legislation's provisions for funding regional medical libraries are being interpreted in some regions of the country in a manner that impedes the development of the best kind of library service for nursing and certain allied health professions. We believe that the law should be broadened to correct this situation.

Specifically, the National Library of Medicine has required that some regional medical libraries (e.g., in Boston and Philadelphia) rely on nursing collections in other institutions rather than build strong nursing collections in the central regional library itself. This refusal to fund central collections in all health fields encourages perpetuation of the present fragmentation and scattering of health literature collections. As a result, a nurse or other health worker in search of a comprehensive health library has no single place where her library needs can be met. It is not enough to coordinate mail service from a variety of back-up libraries, as is done at present. Strong centralized collections are needed in each region to serve visiting library users according to their special health interests.

We ask that deviations of the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 contain clear directives that, while existing library resources continue to share through cooperative arrangements in providing better health library service for all, positive steps be taken to build up one central, comprehensive health library collection in each region for the in-house use of visiting health scholars.

Sincerely,
VIRGINIA HENDERSEN,
Chairman, Advisory Committee on Library Resources for Nurses in the New England Region (ad hoc).

EMORY UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY,
Atlanta, June 5, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I would like to take this opportunity to provide you with information that may help you in your decisions pertaining to the renewal of the Medical Library Assistance Act. I am associate professor of dentistry at Emory University and am presently Chairman of the Council on Dental Research of the American Dental Association.

I have seen how our library has used funds from this Act and see changes that will certainly increase the need for improved dental libraries throughout the nation. Our grant for the first year amounted to \$6550.00. This money was spent for new stacks, a reference table, binding of older dental journals, buying needed books and to supplement the salary of a full-time library assistant. We are still not able to supply duplicated copies of journals to our recent graduates who live out in the state and are studying for their specialty boards or who need specific information.

We will be moving into our new dental school building soon with increased space for the library that will need furnishing and equipping. The limited budget of private institutions (especially) will not adequately cover these sorts of expenses.

I believe that practicing dentists will be required to attend specified numbers of hours of continuing education course work

in the near future. Several states are already requiring physicians and dentists to produce evidence of such education in order to participate in certain health programs. This new requirement will certainly add to the use of dental libraries by dentists from private offices who come in to the schools for these courses.

The interest of our Council on Dental Research in promoting more practical research in methods of diagnosing and treating oral and dental disease, certainly includes our concern for the support and expansion of dental library facilities. Little progress can be made in research without adequate communication and information sources.

There is typically a 5 to 10 year lag between the publication of research in the Journals and the inclusion of this information in standard textbooks. The alert practitioner needs access to dental journals to avoid practicing dentistry that is 5 to 10 years obsolete.

I would therefore like to urge your full support of renewal of the Medical Library Assistance Act.

Sincerely yours,
PARKER E. MAHAN, D.D.S., Ph. D.,
Chairman, Council on Dental Research.

S. 2550—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO WELFARE REFORM

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, among the many problems in our outmoded welfare system, one must stand alone as an unparalleled oddity.

Where a man is living in the home in the 25 States which do not have an AFDC—unemployed fathers program. First, if the mother is married to him, she and the children are not eligible for assistance; and second, they are eligible, however, if the man and woman are not married.

This can and should be changed at once.

The largest and fastest growing group of welfare recipients is that of aid to families with dependent children—AFDC. It accounted for three-fourths of the increase in money payments in 1968, and is made up of:

First, 4.6 million children; and second, 1.6 million adults, 1.3 million of which are mothers.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that there are three or fewer children in two-thirds of the families. Almost half of the families have two children or less. More than three-fourths of the children are under 13 years old.

What about the fathers? Where are they and why are they not working to support their families?

The best estimate of HEW is that: First, 5½ percent are dead; second, 12 percent the incapacitated; third, 5 percent are unemployed; and fourth, over 75 percent are "absent" from home.

Until last year 28 States and the District of Columbia denied assistance if there was a man in the house. As a result, many fathers who were unable to find employment abandoned their families so the mothers and children could qualify for welfare.

In the 1968 case of King against Smith, the Supreme Court struck down the man-in-the-house rule. The Court held that States may not deny eligibility on the basis that there is an unrelated man living in the home.

The irony is that we are faced with the situation I described above. This hardly seems the sensible way to encourage some of those "absent" fathers to return home, and assume their responsibilities.

At the present time the unemployed fathers program is optional with the States. Only 25 have chosen to implement it in the 8 years since it was created.

For the family to receive help under this program, the child's father must not have been employed for at least 30 days prior to receipt of aid. The father must not have refused "without good cause" a bona fide offer of employment or training during that period. He must have had six or more quarters of work during any 13 calendar quarters ending within 1 year prior to his application, or in the alternative, received or been qualified for unemployment compensation during that time.

What makes the unemployed father program noteworthy, however, is that: First, the father must be referred to the work incentive program within 30 days after receipt of aid; second, aid is denied if, and for so long as, the father is not currently registered with the public employment office, or if the father receives unemployment compensation; and third, the State welfare agency must enter into a cooperative arrangement with the State vocational education agency to encourage retraining of individuals capable of being retrained.

I believe this program, if made available in all States, may significantly contribute to family stability, bring more families into the mainstream of American economic life, and aid in the prevention of extreme economic and social strain. It certainly could assist measurably in avoiding situations which lead to the desertion of a husband and father to qualify the family for assistance on other grounds.

Colorado already has some experience under the work incentive program, under which welfare payments to an individual are decreased as his or her earnings increase, and the unemployed fathers program. In Denver, for instance, they were able to reduce welfare payments under the unemployed fathers program by \$25 per case during the first 3 months of this year.

I think the approach of the unemployed fathers program is eminently sound, and I hope the Senate will act expeditiously to make its provisions available to these families in the remaining States.

My bill, which I am introducing, would accomplish this, and I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2550) to require that State programs approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act make the aid available thereunder to children in need thereof because of the unemployment of their father, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

July 7, 1969

S. 2552—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH WILSON'S CREEK NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator EAGLETON and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, providing for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park.

The battle at Wilson's Creek, 12 miles southwest of Springfield, Mo., was the first major Civil War battle west of the Mississippi River. On August 9, 1861, Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Lyon of the Union Army marched his troops to Wilson's Creek to meet the Southern force. The battle that ensued was one of the most furious in the war. Confederate casualties in that battle were 1,242; Union casualties were 1,302. General Lyon was among those killed.

This history of legislative proposals to establish a national park at Wilson's Creek dates back to 1917 and the 65th Congress. In 1960, efforts were finally successful; however, that authorization placed a limit on appropriations for development that, according to the Department of the Interior, "has precluded the National Park Service from carrying out an adequate development plan for this area."

The bill introduced today would increase the authorization of funds to \$2,300,000, as recommended by the Interior Department, and would change the name to Wilson's Creek National Battlefield.

Establishment of a national park at the Wilson's Creek Battlefield site is supported by local interests as well as the Missouri General Assembly which has appropriated funds for land acquisition. In May 1968, the Advisory Board on National Parks of the U.S. Interior Department endorsed the provisions of the bill presented today.

In view of present budgetary limitations, it would not be realistic to expect appropriation of the recommended authorization in the near future; nevertheless, passage of this bill would enable local interests who have continued in their strong support to proceed with plans with the assurance that when Federal funds are available their efforts to preserve the site at Wilson's Creek as a national park will be realized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2552) to amend the act of April 22, 1960, providing for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. EAGLETON) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2554—INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PRERETIREMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce for myself, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from

West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), a bill to provide Federal employees with a comprehensive program of preretirement counseling and assistance. I introduced a similar proposal in 1967 as S. 2295 of the 90th Congress.

The bill I propose today is modified in significant detail and I am very hopeful that it will receive early and favorable consideration in the Senate. Enactment of this proposal will, I believe, take us far toward the goal articulated by President Kennedy—the objective of adding new life to the new years which science is adding to man's lifespan.

The institution of retirement has been described as one of the most difficult adjustments in life. Physicians have testified that one of the most common syndromes treated by general practitioners is that known as retirement shock. This underscores the perplexing combination of confusion and anxiety which afflicts many about to end their working careers.

Most retirees know something about the experiences they will encounter as retirees. Yet very few know more than a little about the actual dimensions of the psychological and physical adjustments which retirement necessitates. For the average retiree, the end of work brings a new awareness that ours is a society which is both youth-oriented and work-oriented. For many, therefore, retirement brings a loss of identity and incentive. For a few, retirement also results in a loss of interest in living.

I believe that retirement from a job need not lead to retirement from life. Scientists tell us that as a man slows physically he often matures mentally; as one's capacity for productive output decreases his facility for creative work often increases. Yet to maximize retirement potential one must prepare himself in advance; he must develop his interests and resources over the years against the day of his retirement. He must learn the importance of remaining active and of maintaining the vital, life-giving interest in others. He must, in a phrase, learn the technique which John Gardner has called self-renewal. That technique encourages an openness and flexibility in personal life which facilitates fulfillment and growth in every situation.

It has been said that "today, education is for life on the job, but more and more we need education for life off the job, so that we can derive the most from our leisure." I share that conviction. Education on the job for life off the job can, in my judgment, facilitate the kind of self-renewal which is essential to meaningful retirement.

At one of the hearings in 1967 before the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual, Mr. Gardner, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said:

Sometime during the middle years of life, preferably several years before retirement . . . every person should have access to effective preretirement information and education about some of the common problems and adjustments that are experienced in the retirement period.

He added:

I would like to stress here again the importance of tailoring preretirement training to the needs of persons about to retire. Merely offering a series of lectures or classes will accomplish little. There must be individual counseling so that the special concerns of each person may be discussed privately and dealt with. And there must be a concerted effort to maintain contact with the older person as he nears the age of retirement and after he retires.

In his report to President Johnson in December 1968, Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, proposed a bill of rights for older people. Under one of the 10 proposed rights he included, "preretirement counseling of high quality to assist in meeting the problems of retirement."

The American Association of Retired Persons is keenly aware of the importance of preretirement programs. As a result of its 1967 study which disclosed that relatively few Federal employees had access to an adequate program of preretirement counseling, it recently prepared and published an excellent guide entitled "Preparation for Retirement." This guide is designed to assist agencies in developing appropriate programs for Government employees, and offers a practical outline of the subjects and factors that should be considered.

Universities have devoted a great deal of attention to the problems of adjustments to retirement; and organized labor, industry, and business have begun to recognize the need and desirability of preretirement planning. Many have established retirement programs. The United Steel Workers of America and the United Automobile Workers of America in cooperation with universities, have developed and introduced comprehensive programs and have trained union representatives to conduct them. Moreover, there is a growing belief that it is an employer's responsibility to provide such programs. It is my belief that this is a responsibility that the Federal Government can no longer shirk.

In order to ascertain the need for retirement planning programs, the U.S. Civil Service Commission conducted a study last summer in which a large sample of Federal employees nearing retirement or retired 1 to 3 years was asked to respond to a number of questions. Among other things, the study disclosed that almost all those interviewed liked the idea of a preretirement planning program and thought that a good program could help people enjoy retirement more; that less than 18 percent had a preretirement planning program available to them; and that most of those who did attend found the program useful.

Acting on this study, Chairman Robert Hampton of the Civil Service Commission announced in April that the Commission's position on preretirement counseling of Federal employees had changed "from one of neutrality to one of promoting, encouraging, and assisting in the establishment of retirement planning services throughout the Federal community." He also stated that the Commission planned to offer a program of training for agency retirement advisers.

July 7, 1969

S 7571

The bill I am introducing today provides the statutory muscle for the Civil Service Commission by requiring that all Federal employees who are eligible for or approaching retirement shall have available an appropriate program of retirement assistance. It also calls upon the Civil Service Commission to establish standards for such programs, provide training for agency retirement advisers, and study and publish guidelines about related work-life programs such as phased retirement, trial retirement, new kinds of part-time work, and sabbaticals.

Enactment of this bill will, I believe, greatly reduce the anxiety and dread of Federal employees who approach retirement. Hopefully, it will stimulate positive thinking about retirement by providing employees with the factual information and counseling which will enable them to understand the nature of retirement problems and to plan their leisure years intelligently.

Mr. President, I believe that the preretirement training and counseling programs developed as a result of this proposal will enable the Federal Government to assume a leadership position in an important but largely neglected area. I am hopeful, moreover, that the programs engendered by this bill will serve as models for adoption by State and local governments and by industry and business.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2554) to provide certain services for Government employees in order to assist them in preparing for retirement, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2554

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Preretirement Assistance Act of 1969."

That subchapter I of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 8302. PRERETIREMENT ASSISTANCE.

"(a) For the purpose of this section, 'agency' means an Executive agency or the government of the District of Columbia.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (d) (3) of this section, the head of each agency shall formulate and carry out a program to provide comprehensive preretirement assistance to employees of such agency who are eligible, or approaching eligibility, for retirement.

"(c) Each such program shall provide for furnishing to interested employees such educational or informational materials, group training sessions, group and individual counseling services, and other assistance as may be necessary to aid them in preparing for and adjusting to a retirement status.

"(d) (1) Each such program shall be conducted in accordance with standards prescribed in regulations to be promulgated by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission

shall provide appropriate training for any employee of an agency which is to provide preretirement assistance under such program. If deemed advisable, the Commission may enter into contracts with educational and other institutions to provide such training.

"(2) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide—

"(A) such training and other assistance in the development and evaluation of such programs as the Commission may request; and

"(B) technical assistance and formulate such program models as may be necessary to meet the specific needs of an agency subject to the provisions of this section. Such models may be used in formulating the standards prescribed in the regulations promulgated by the Commission under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3) (A) If the Commission determines, upon request of an agency, that it is not practicable for the agency to comply with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the Commission may grant such agency an exemption from providing a program of retirement assistance for its employees. Such exemption shall be reviewed at least once every six months and shall remain in effect if, at the time of each review, there is a determination by the Commission that it continues to be impracticable for the agency to provide such a program.

"(B) If an exception is granted under this paragraph, the Commission shall take such measures as may be necessary to provide employees of such agency with an appropriate program of preretirement assistance.

"(e) Such interagency cooperation as is necessary to obtain maximum utilization of resources shall be undertaken to achieve the purposes of this section. The head of an agency is authorized and requested to provide informational materials, group training services, group and individual counseling services, and other assistance to another such agency or to employees of such other agency when it is more economical or feasible to do so"; and

(2) by adding at the end of the analysis of such subchapter, preceding section 8301, the following new item: "8302. Preretirement assistance."

SEC. 2. The Civil Service Commission shall make a study of existing and recommended practices, both within and outside the Government of the United States, which relate to work-life and study programs, including phased retirement, trial retirement, new kinds of part-time work, and sabbaticals. With the assistance of agencies and officers of the Government of the United States, including the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and educational institutions, the Commission shall, based on such study, establish guidelines concerning such programs for the information and use of such agencies.

SEC. 3. Within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Civil Service Commission shall submit a report to the President and the Congress on the program of retirement assistance required by the amendment made by the first section of this Act and on the development of new work-life and study programs by agencies of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 4. Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Civil Service Commission shall promulgate regulations to establish standards for conducting programs of retirement assistance as authorized by the first section of this Act. Not later than 6 months after such date of enactment, the Commission shall place into operation a program for providing the training required by section 8302 (d) (1) of title 5, United States Code (as added by the first section of this Act).

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with comments made by Senator MONDALE concerning introduction of a bill to provide programs of preretirement counseling and planning for Federal employees.

The need for this legislation has become clear in studies conducted by the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging. As chairman of that committee I am especially aware of the contribution made by Senator MONDALE and his Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual in conducting hearings which clearly established that an emerging "retirement revolution" is taking place in this Nation, even though this Nation is not prepared for all the consequences of that revolution.

Hearings conducted by the subcommittee in June and July 1967 showed conclusively that most retirees experienced great difficulty in adjusting to retirement, and that not only the individual but society also were generally unaware of the seriousness and complexity of the program.

Indeed, expert witnesses at committee hearings have described a "shock syndrome" which accompanies retirement. Many workers are only vaguely aware of the psychological and social changes they will experience after they leave the job. When they actually retire, they experience trauma that could have been avoided if they had prepared adequately.

We must find ways to begin thinking and planning for retirement well in advance of the actual date. Fortunately, the bill introduced today offers Federal employees a variety of services and programs designed to smooth the transition between work and retirement. They can look at retirement from a distance, prepare for it, and meet it well and wisely when it comes.

With the help of this bill, the Federal Government can at last become a model for other, similar efforts in business and in industry. This bill will set the stage for expanded programs of preretirement preparation, and those programs in turn, will set the stage for a more satisfying life after work is through.

S. 2559—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 901 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify and strengthen the maritime cargo-preference laws of the United States and put an end to the wasteful practice of paying double subsidies to certain shipping interests.

Section 1 of the bill deals with cargo generated by agencies of the U.S. Government and shipped to foreign nations under the provisions of Public Law 480.

Public Law 480 is the means by which the United States uses its abundant agricultural productivity to combat hunger and malnutrition in friendly countries. Since its inception in 1954, through 1967, over \$12 million worth of foodstuffs have been shipped to needy nations. The program has been highly effective in opening up outlets for American surplus food and commodities. This has helped stabilize

July 7, 1969

the U.S. agricultural economy and so lessen the public tax burden of storing surplus food.

Though the humanitarian objectives of the law are commendable, the law was also designed to assist the U.S. economy. The act states that the foreign currencies which accrue under title I sales—goods sold for local currencies—are to be used to “expand international trade” and to “encourage economic development.”

The program, through its secondary grants of food receipts, is supposed to open up markets to American exports and eventually return dollars to the United States. From 1954 through 1967, \$153,746,000, or 17.5 percent, of local currency receipts from Public Law 480 were used for U.S. obligations in the recipient nation such as payment of U.S. Embassy expenses. Since these expenses would otherwise have been paid in dollars this practice has exerted a favorable effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

During the 10-year period, 1957-66, however, the American balance-of-payments deficit amounted to \$23 billion. Without the contribution of \$5.7 billion to the balance during this same period by the U.S. merchant marine the deficit would have been \$28.7 billion.

The balance of payments is an accounting summary of transactions between the United States and foreign countries. The greatest gross value segment is the exchange of goods and services, including transportation. Commodity exports, under Public Law 480's title IV must be paid for in U.S. dollars. When these dollars are paid there is a positive and direct effect on our balance of payments.

However, the favorable effects of these transactions are diluted by the fact that 50 percent or more of the Public Law 480 cargo is carried on foreign ships. If the 50 percent were being shipped on the recipient nation's flag vessels one might argue that this practice was further strengthening the economy of these underdeveloped countries. However, the principle recipients of Public Law 480 cargo do not have the ships to carry this trade.

The third flag carriers are the highly developed nations of Japan, Norway, Germany, and England. In addition, 28.4 percent of all U.S. oceanborne commerce is carried by ships registered under the Liberian flag. A large share of these ships are American “runaways.” The combined competition of these nations on the high seas has been so effective that the American merchant marine now carries only about 5 percent of our commercial imports and exports.

Each dollar spent on foreign-flag shipping has a negative impact on our balance of payments. Each dollar spent on shipping American flag has a positive impact. In the 3-year period 1964-66, American-flag carriage of Government-sponsored cargo resulted in a positive impact of approximately \$1.3 billion to our balance of payments. Without the use of American bottoms our deficit would have been significantly worse.

Under the Cargo Preference Act, at least 50 percent of Government cargoes is required to be shipped on American-flag vessels. The present cargo preference system, as it is administered, has

made this 50 percent a maximum, in contravention of the law and congressional intent, and ignored the formidable contribution American shipping can make toward solving our balance-of-payments position. For example, in 1967—the most recent year for which complete figures are available—only 39.7 percent of Public Law 480 shipments were on U.S.-flag ships.

Though it is true that American shipping rates are greater and frequently more than double foreign rates, the comparison, without considering the beneficial results of conserving U.S. dollars, would be incomplete. Although it is difficult to obtain complete information, the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture has computed that the average 1968 ocean freight rates from U.S. gulf ports to the west coast of India was \$11.65 per ton of grain on foreign ships, and \$27.50 per ton of grain on U.S. ships.

Through March 1969, 810,000 tons have been shipped in India under a Public Law 480 grain agreement signed December 23, 1968, for 2.3 million tons; 408,000 tons have been carried on U.S.-flag ships, and 402,000 tons on foreign ships. These figures do not reflect the 1969 ration of all Public Law 480 cargo carried by U.S. ships vis-a-vis foreign vessels.

The specific freight costs for these shipments to India are not available. However, based on the Agriculture Department's average rates for shipments to India from U.S. gulf ports, we can come up with an approximate freight cost of \$4,683,300 for the portion shipped via foreign vessels, and \$11,220,000 for American-flag shipments; or a total freight cost of \$15,903,300. If foreign ships were exclusively used, the total freight bill would have been \$9,436,500.

On the surface, American flag shipping might look like a \$6-million extravagance. However, a Harbridge House study on the balance of payments and the U.S. merchant marine points out that there is a 35-percent gain in our balance of payments from using U.S. versus foreign-flag ships. This means that paying the higher U.S. rate actually contributed around \$4 million to our balance of payments.

After taking the balance-of-payments contribution into consideration, it would appear the Government still paid out \$2.5 million more than necessary. But this is not the case. The \$4 million consists primarily of wages paid to American crewmen and relatively inadequate profits to American shipowners. This money enters America's economic bloodstream and is pumped into American consumer products, and taxes to Federal, State, and local government.

Every dollar spent by someone in the economy is also a dollar of income to somebody else. About two-thirds of income is spent on personal consumption. In light of the critical shortage of State and local funds for education, urban renewal, and so forth, the increased revenue generated through sales tax is particularly important. The remaining third is apportioned to savings and income and property taxes. Therefore, after each round of spending a smaller amount of personal income is generated. However,

after several rounds of spending the total income generated will amount to approximately three times the amount originally injected into the economy. The \$4 million contributed to the Nation's payments receipts will eventually generate around \$12 million worth of income to American citizens.

A conservative estimate would be that the average American consumer pays approximately 16 percent Federal income tax and 8 percent State and local tax. Based on this figure, of the \$12 million of generated income, close to \$2 million will be returned to the Federal Government in income tax, and another million will be paid in tax to State and local governments.

This is only one example of the immediate economic effect of using American shipping. The unsubsidized segment of the American merchant marine is almost entirely dependent upon Government cargo for its existence. However, currently the unsubsidized ships are not earning enough to warrant replacing obsolete ships. There is no question that if the percentage of U.S. Government generated cargo shipped in American bottoms were increased, unsubsidized shipowners would be in a better position to build new ships. This investment in capital equipment would have an even greater effect on the economy and substantially increase the amount of money returned to the Government in taxes.

In 1967, 9,490,000 tons were shipped on foreign-flag vessels. Complete figures are not available as to the destination of these shipments or the freight costs incurred. However, if we assume an average American shipping costs of \$15 per ton, about \$142 million could have been spent on American shipping. This American-flag shipping investment would have represented an input of about \$50 million to our balance-of-payments receipts. Experience in the United States has shown that an input of 50 million will generate about \$150 million worth of additional American income. However, under existing cargo administrative practices, this additional income has been denied the American people.

The economic welfare of American industry is not based upon the artificially induced foreign aid markets, but is based upon the buying power of the American consumer. This is specially true of the American farmer. The American businessman and farmer can remain the wealthiest in the world only there is a strong American dollar, and only if the American people, including the merchant seaman, have the economic ability to buy American goods.

Section 2 of the bill would put an end to the present practice of paying subsidy to the U.S.-flag lines to meet foreign-flag competition, and then permitting the subsidized lines to use the subsidy to bid against unsubsidized American operators for carriage of cargoes reserved for U.S.-flagships. In this way, the subsidy paid is wasted, the U.S.-flag share of our foreign commerce is reduced, and unsubsidized operators are deprived of the cargoes they need if they are to survive without direct Government subsidy.

Despite Government subsidy payments of over \$300 million a year, the Ameri-

June 5, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

have purchased their own picnic tables and chairs to carry along so that they won't have to pay the Camp fee. Now you know what this means: Every car-turn-off place and stream in the entire West will be littered and polluted until it will be impossible to clean up.

Perhaps the Government feels it cannot afford to build and maintain more Parks and camp sites . . . but, can it afford not to, when in these times it is so important for city-stressed people to be able to get but and away for a weekend, or even a Sunday picnic? Does the Government REALLY want its citizens to vacation in their own country?

If those who actually use the Parks must be the ones to help pay for their upkeep, then, surely, the Golden Eagle Passport should be enough payment. Let those who demand more expensive facilities seek privately owned camps.

Let's build more and better camp and picnic areas for the increasing population, and PLEASE, not impose concessionaires, or more costly fees.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. CLARK AMOS.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I announced some weeks ago that I would introduce a bill to extend the Golden Eagle passport. Since that time I have been working closely with the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) and other members of the Senate Interior Committee in the preparation of such a bill. We have decided that the best approach is legislation which will provide for the continuation of the Golden Eagle passport beyond the date now set for its expiration—March 31, 1970. This is the measure I take pleasure in sponsoring today.

I realize that others have rushed in with Golden Eagle passport bills which make some changes in the program, but it is my opinion that a direct extension of the program as it now exists is the more realistic and comprehensive approach.

There is no doubt in my mind that the American people want to see this particular American Eagle kept alive. Since 1965, the passport has allowed the bearer and everyone riding with him in his private vehicle to enter any federally operated recreation area without paying the fees charged at any of these areas.

Although the passport idea was resisted to some extent when it was first inaugurated, it has more than proved itself in the past 5 years, and its popularity, in my part of the country at least, is substantial. It has been an "open sesame" to wider admittance and greater use of our Federal recreation areas for many American families, and I predict its use will soar as more and more people become aware of its low cost and convenience.

The first year the passport was in operation—fiscal year 1965—it brought in only \$663,000 in revenue to be deposited in the land and water conservation fund, and apportioned among the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries to acquire national outdoor recreation lands and waters, and for matching grants to the States to acquire and develop recreational areas and facilities.

In fiscal 1966, sale of Golden Eagle passports brought \$2,819,000; in fiscal 1967, \$3,795,000; in fiscal 1968, \$4,846,000 and in fiscal 1969, through April 30,

\$3,294,000, with the heaviest use months yet to come.

It is impossible to know how many people were admitted to our recreation areas under these passports, or how many used the camping grounds or other facilities, because the Golden Eagle is a family-type permit, and a car with one of them could contain as many as six or even more persons when it passed through the entrance gates and often does. We do know that the number of permits issued grew from only 90,000 in the first full year in which the permit was in effect to 692,000 in the last full year, fiscal 1968. In the first half of fiscal 1969, over 400,000 were issued.

I understand there has been some disappointment in the Department of the Interior because the amount of revenue generated from the passport has not lived up to projections. I suggest first that perhaps the projections were too ambitious, and second, that the figures I have just quoted indicate that the use of the passport, and the revenues from it will continue to grow—and grow substantially—if it is not terminated. Also, there are many people who would be more than willing to pay more—even \$10 or \$15 a year—for the privilege of buying one passport which would admit them to about 3,000 Federal recreational areas.

I have received many letters from people in Utah who explain far better than I am able to do so what the Golden Eagle passport means to them and their families. I ask unanimous consent to place excerpts from several typical letters in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: I have had the pleasure of using the Golden Eagle Passport since it came into existence. In fact I purchase three each year. One for each of our two children and their families and one for ourselves.

It has just come to my attention that Congress has silently, with very little notice and with lack of sufficient information to the majority of people affected, voted the pass discontinued as of April 1, 1970.

It is hard to understand when the program was expanding so rapidly in the direction in which it was originally intended, for the purchase of additional recreational land, having increased from 90,000 in 1965 to 692,000 in 1968, why the Golden Pass was made a scapegoat in such a manner and eliminated. . . . I remember the years before the Golden Pass when one could not even find a place to stop to eat a picnic lunch without being exploited by individuals who had been given concessions or the right to charge a fee just to stop for a short while. I feel there should have been more public notice of the final impending action against the Golden Eagle Pass so that residents who favor it could have brought favorable pressure to bear. . . .

NORTH OGDEN, UTAH.

A. E. GARNER.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: I have purchased the Golden Eagle Passport each year since its inception and I'm sure that millions of others have done likewise. I think that this in itself indicates that the American people are concerned about their National Park Service and are willing to support its growth and improvement. I believe that the abolishment of this passport is a rebuff of the faith of the American people.

Let's keep our Forest Service Rangers and other essential personnel in these parks and if we need more, let's get more. I'm sure that most citizens that use the parks would be more than glad to pay an additional one or two dollars for their passports if the increase is justified.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD R. BROOKS.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

DEAN SENATOR MOSS: In regard to the Golden Eagle Program, we feel at this time we would like to express our interest in keeping the Golden Eagle Passport in force, and would appreciate anything you could do. . . . We are a couple of travelling people. We have supported the Golden Eagle from the beginning.

We, and all our friends, would be willing to pay more than \$7. In fact, we have heard that it will probably be impossible to go camping, because the costs will be prohibitive if the Government allows private enterprise to take over.

Sincerely yours,

VELMA and EARL JOHNSON.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: It has come to my attention that the Golden Eagle Pass will go out of existence next year, according to a law passed by our present Congress . . .

We have been a trailering family for six years now and belong to a small trailer club. We use these Federal parks at least once a month during the summer months, and really enjoy them. We also spend a two-week vacation this way each year. And really, I think the Golden Eagle Pass is the thing for this type of vacation. Where otherwise we could not afford two weeks away from home . . .

We wish to thank you for any help you may give us toward the repeal of this recent law passed by Congress which would eliminate the Golden Eagle Pass. Even a raise in price to \$10 would not be out of line at this time.

Yours truly,

LEONARD L. ROSS.

OGDEN, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: Much to my disappointment and surprise I find that "The Golden Eagle Passport" has been silently shot down while our backs were turned. The article that I read indicated that it may be too late to submit a protest, but I am surely going to appeal to you personally to use your influence to discourage this action if at all possible.

This has done more for outdoor people like myself than anything that has ever happened in the past in the way of encouraging people to spend more time in the great outdoors.

The facilities that have been provided for us through this program have been absolutely fabulous. We need more of them and I think that the Golden Eagle Passport will get them for us.

Please don't let them discontinue this program.

Sincerely,

FLOYD YATES.

MAGNA, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: This letter is written in protest of the manner in which the Golden Eagle Passport was voted out of existence as of 1 April 1970. I am an ardent recreational vehicle enthusiast and outdoorsman and subscribe to numerous hunting and fishing periodicals, trailer and camper magazines and it was not until recently that I became aware that the Golden Eagle Passport was no more. Apparently no one can offer a reasonable explanation except that certain groups silently and "sneakily" pressured

June 5, 1969

their Congressman to vote the passport out. * * *

The Golden Eagle Passport was probably the greatest single piece of assistance the Federal Government ever gave to vacationing families, hunters, fishermen and all those who love the outdoors. No recreational boom in history compares with the current interest in camping. It is estimated that 50 million Americans will indulge during 1969. * * *

It is absolutely essential that a national camping program provide more education to our urban population in the care and use of our wonderful natural environment.

This plan should provide for the enlargement of regional vacation areas, with more surrounding state parks, private campgrounds and resorts to serve the ever rising tide of recreational travelers. Certainly local communities have a great responsibility to relieve the intolerable pressure on national and state parks. * * *

May we respectfully ask that you indicate to us what your feelings are in this regard and advise what you intend to do now and in the future.

Very truly yours,

(Signed by some 80 Utahans).

Mr. MOSS. Among those who would be most seriously hurt if the Golden Eagle passport is not continued are older people who have retired. Many of them have saved for years to buy trailers and camping equipment so they might see as many of America's national parks and monuments and forests and other recreational areas as possible, and if they have to pay separate entrance fees to each one of them, they simply cannot afford to go.

I also ask unanimous consent to place excerpts from several letters in the RECORD which explain how people already retired—or soon to retire—feel.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: We want to add our voices to the thousands of others who are protesting the cancellation of the Golden Eagle Passport to our National Parks and Recreation Areas. * * *

It makes one lost what little faith there was left in the fairness of our government.

We have paid taxes all of our lives and we think the Golden Eagle is the fairest thing ever, especially for retired people and others of moderate means. We have purchased one every year and with its help we have managed to see a little bit of 45 of the 50 states. By the time of retirement from U.S. Forest Service work, we had managed to acquire a comfortable camper outfit, and hoped to be able to see all we could of our beautiful outdoors. Now with the elimination of the Passport it looks doubtful.

Even if we have to pay more for the Golden Eagle, at least we would know what to expect. * * *

Please, Senator Moss, use whatever influence you have to either renew or replace with a pass equally fair, before the Golden Eagle Passport expires.

Thank you,

Mr. and Mrs. E. L. BROWN.
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: Again I am writing you concerning the Golden Eagle Pass. It has come to my attention that the present Congress has voted the pass out of existence and I want to strongly protest this unfair action. * * *

My husband and I plan to retire in three years and have long looked forward to the time when we could travel and see this beloved country of ours, with the convenience of our travel trailer. Being able to spend some

time in our National Forests is a cherished dream which we certainly cannot afford on retirement pay if we have to pay unreasonable prices to park our trailer. * * *

Thank you very much,

Mr. and Mrs. WESLEY H. MOORE.

CLEARFIELD, UTAH.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, an excellent case can be made for continuing the Golden Eagle passport beyond the expiration date of May 31, 1970, and we are taking the first step here today in the introduction of the bill which is sponsored by the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Idaho, and myself. The next step will be hearings in the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and I am confident they will be scheduled at an early date.

S. 2324—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REPEAL THE REPORTING REQUIREMENT CONTAINED IN SUBSECTION (b) OF SECTION 1308, RELATING TO THE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TRAINING ACT OF 1958

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal subsection (b) of section 1308 of title 5, United States Code, which requires that the Civil Service Commission report annually to the President for physical transmittal to Congress a report of those employees who, during a designated fiscal year, participated in training in non-Governmental facilities in courses that were over 120 days in duration and those employees who received awards or contributions incident to training in non-Government facilities.

A summary of the information contained in these forms is also included in the annual report of the Civil Service entitled "Report on Agency Training Activities." The repeal of this subsection will not eliminate the necessity for each agency to report to the Civil Service Commission, but would eliminate the necessity of the preparation of a report transmitting the forms to the President and the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2324) to amend title 5, United States Code, to repeal the reporting requirement contained in subsection (b) of section 1308, relating to the Government Employees Training Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. McGEE (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2325—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL SUPERGRADES IN THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 5 to provide for additional supergrades in the classified civil service.

This legislation was submitted to the Senate by the chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission on behalf of the administration. It provides for additional supergrades to be administered by the

Civil Service Commission and for special allotments to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the General Accounting Office, the Library of Congress, and the National Security Agency.

Earlier this year legislation was introduced to provide a special allotment of supergrades for certain officers of the Smithsonian Institution. I anticipate that early hearings can be scheduled on this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2325) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, introduced by Mr. McGEE (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2326—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to revise the civil service retirement system.

This legislation is identical to the bill pending on the calendar of the House of Representatives at the present time, and I hope that early hearings can be scheduled so that enactment of significant reforms, particularly in regard to retirement benefits for Federal employees as well as improved financing for the retirement fund can be enacted before Congress adjourns this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2326) to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGEE (by request), was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2327—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE CONSTRUCTION OF EXTENSIONS OF THE AMERICAN CANAL AT EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for myself and my colleague (Mr. Tower) to authorize construction of extensions of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex. This irrigation canal replacement is requested to complete the series of public facility projects in El Paso contemplated as a part of the boundary relocation involved in the settlement of the Chamizal dispute with Mexico.

Enactment of this bill will allow construction of a new American-Franklin Canal some 13 miles long, of a size to assure U.S. water users their share of the Rio Grande water allocation to them by the United States-Mexican Treaty of 1906. Part of the proposed new canal is being constructed as a necessary part of the Chamizal boundary relocation; this bill authorizes construction of the remaining needed sections.

April 28, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 3139

true; in fact one of the participants admits its substance. I believe, and have so informed the Administrator of the SBA that this matter warrants the immediate suspension of the special assistant, Mr. Albert Fuentes.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the affidavit I received, a copy of the feasibility study aforementioned, and a copy of a telegram I sent the Administrator of the SBA:

State of Texas, County of Bexar:

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day, personally appeared Emanuel Salaz, who, after being by me duly sworn, upon his oath, stated the following:

"My name is Emanuel Salaz, I am the owner and operator of E & S Sales, San Antonio, Texas. Since early 1967, I have been attempting to obtain a loan from SBA in order to improve and continue my business. I was finally approved for a loan from SBA in the amount of \$10,000 in February, 1969. Many people intervened for me during these years and when I finally was approved by SBA I was of the opinion that the successful efforts in my behalf were made by Mr. Eddie Montez and Mr. Albert Fuentes. I reached this opinion because Mr. Montez and Mr. Fuentes never let me forget it. When I was approved for the \$10,000 I was instructed along the following lines by Eddie Montez and Albert Fuentes, 'Let us complete the research and then we will talk to you about your business loan. Don't accept the \$10,000 until we talk to you.'

"I did not accept the \$10,000 and I waited until the 'research was complete.' I was called to a meeting in the office of Mr. Tom Guardia on a Sunday, one week before Easter. At this meeting, the following were present: Tom Guardia, Eddie Montez, G. J. Gonzales, myself and Albert Fuentes and a Mr. de la Rose who runs the Alameda Restaurant. At this meeting I was advised by Mr. Montez that it was a personal meeting before but now it was strictly business. At this meeting I was handed a research on survey report allegedly by one W. J. Garvin, Assistant Administrator, United States Government Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., dated March 20, 1969. The report is hereto attached and made a part of this statement for all intents and purposes. Albert Fuentes told me that this report would help in obtaining for me a larger sum of money. He told me that it would be necessary for me to incorporate and to pledge to them 49 per cent of the corporation, that Mr. Tom Guardia would set up the corporation and take care of distribution of the 49 per cent. When I asked if this was legal, Mr. Fuentes assured me that it was; Mr. Montez assured me that Mr. Guardia would set up the 49 per cent properly and that Mr. Fuentes' share would be set up in trust.

"Mr. Fuentes then told me, 'I'm not going to be here very long and when I get out I have to have something to fall back on.' They told me that if I did not incorporate there would be no loan of the type as suggested in the research on survey report. I told all of them I would send my lawyer, Tom Joseph, to talk to Mr. Guardia and I left. Mr. Joseph referred me to Mr. Rudy Esquivel, Chairman of the SBA Council. I worried for about a week and finally talked to Mr. Esquivel on Friday, April 18, 1969. When I advised Mr. Esquivel about the possible conflict of interest involved here he advised me that the investigating arm of the government was the FBI. I went to the FBI and made a statement to Agent Miller in the San Antonio, Texas office."

"I have made this statement of my own free will and every statement of fact herein contained is true and correct."

EMANUEL SALAZ.

Sworn to and subscribed before me on the 24th day of April, 1969 to certify which witness my hand and seal of office.

JESSE B. CAMPOS,

Notary Public.

U.S. GOVERNMENT SMALL

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969.

Reply to Attention of E.

Subject: E. & S. Sales Co.

To: Mr. Albert Fuentes, Special Assistant to the Administrator.

As previously reported we have continued our analysis of the market outlook for a capital needs of this company and now believe that we have pursued the matter as far as we profitably can from this distance.

The Market Outlook: Excellent prospects for the immediate and foreseeable future, both for specialized, custom type ornamental hardware and for more standardized high volume output. A well managed firm should prosper and grow in this location.

Capital Needs: We have analyzed several alternative types of manufacturing facility which might be considered. The two best choices seem to be:

a. *Moving the existing business* out of the garage into a manufacturing facility, with expanded output but no basic change in operations. That is, the company would continue to design its unique ornamental hardware, contract with an outside foundry for casting services, and perform the finishing work in its own building. This would require:

A building with about 5000 feet of floor space (costing \$10,000 to \$12,000 plus land unless leased space is available).

About \$20,000 worth of equipment.

Working capital of up to \$20,000 for an annual sales volume of \$100,000 to \$150,000.

Thus total investment requirements would be on the order of \$40,000 for leased facilities and \$50,000 to \$60,000 for purchased facilities. The advantages of this choice are:

It could be set up quickly.

It would make best use of the specialized skills of the existing company.

It can expand, to keep pace with the market.

It could later be developed into a more integrated operation doing its own foundry work.

b. *Going immediately into an integrated operation.* This is basically the choice indicated by Mr. Salaz. This would be a complete design, casting and finishing operation in a large manufacturing facility. Industry experts and our own research indicates total initial capital requirements (including working capital) to be at least \$200,000. It would need to reach an annual sales volume of up to \$1 million for efficient operations.

The principal advantage of this choice is that it would expand employment opportunities and contribute significantly to community development. It would need to move more towards standardized, mass produced hardware rather than the present custom type. It would also take at least a year before operation could begin.

Recommendation: I recommend alternative in (a)—the smaller, more specialized facility—as the most promising immediate source of action. Alternative in (b) would not be ruled out as an eventual solution. If the business is as successful as I believe it could be, expansion into an integrated operation could well be undertaken through a local development company or a small business investment company.

Other considerations: I have given the data on the E & S bid on the defense order for door handles to Mr. Bothmer. I have also been advised that several score volunteers could be made available at nominal costs to assist in management training and counseling. Finally, Mr. Salaz does not have a good accounting system and—according to reports—could not be persuaded to furnish cost and sales data needed to support a loan application. An expanded operation would require installation of an efficient accounting system.

W. J. GARVIN,

Assistant Administrator.

APRIL 24, 1969.

Mr. HILARY SANDOVAL,

Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.:

Affidavits in my possession and on file with the Federal Bureau of Investigation show that there is serious reason to believe Albert Fuentes has engaged or attempted to engage in shakedowns of SBA loan applicants. I believe that this warrants your immediately suspending Fuentes pending a full investigation.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,

Member of Congress.

A MEANS OF HALTING ILLEGAL SEIZURES OF U.S. FISHING BOATS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing new legislation to try to bring the Peruvians and other Latin American countries that illegally seize American fishing boats on the high seas to negotiations.

This bill would cut off imports of fish and fish products from these countries in the event of future seizures. In the case of Peru, such imports amount to a substantial dollar figure. Commerce Department figures indicate that in 1968, Peru exported \$62.1 million to the United States.

However, Mr. Speaker, such a cutoff would not be effective while discussions were going on. Let me emphasize that my bill is not to punish anyone, but rather to have disputes arising from seizures of our fishing vessels off their coasts taken to the negotiation table and to achieve some understanding.

We do not have to argue over their claim of 200 miles or over our claim of 12 miles. All we ask is that these countries honor our historic rights the same as Canada, Mexico, and the United States honor historic rights of other nations to fish in their fishing zones.

Meanwhile, I am fearful that our fishing dispute has been put aside during the discussions on the problem of Peru's expropriation of an oil plant, and I want to be assured that American fishermen are heard during the meetings now being held or to be held shortly between the United States and Peru.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have a greater fear, and that is that within the next few weeks there will be additional sei-

H 3140

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 28, 1969

zures off the Latin American coast, and as I informed my colleagues last Thursday, the International Longshoremen's Union has passed a resolution which could lead to their refusing to unload ships from any country illegally seizing U.S. fishing vessels. This, I would like to prevent, Mr. Speaker, and I feel that a law such as would be provided by the legislation I am introducing today would accomplish this by Government rather than by union action.

Time is important as we face the start of another fishing season off Latin America, and I urge swift consideration of this new legislation I am introducing today.

File

THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD PAY 100 PERCENT OF CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES' HEALTH BENEFITS COSTS

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation—H.R. 10593—to require the Federal Government to pay 100 percent of health benefits costs for Federal employees.

I believe that the Government has an obligation to be in the forefront in providing fringe benefits and good working conditions for its employees rather than trailing behind private enterprise as has been the case. Today, many enlightened firms pay all of the health benefits costs of their employees. Surely, the time has come for the Federal Government to take this enlightened step.

Originally, the health benefits law provided that the Civil Service Commission would establish the Federal contribution within a specified dollar range, but not more than 50 percent of the least expensive low-option plan offered by one of two Government-wide carriers. Due to the increasing costs of the high option plans, the Government's share of the total premiums was down to less than 30 percent by 1966.

Public Law 89-504 increased the Government's contribution rate, restoring it to the 1960 level of 38 percent of the total premiums, and eliminated the tie-in of the Government contribution to the low option rates. However, due to subsequent rate increases, the Government's contribution has since fallen to about 32 percent of the total premium costs. Congress should act promptly to rectify this inequity.

There have been several proposals in past Congresses and in the current Congress to have the Government assume varying percentages of employee health benefits premiums. In fact, during the 90th Congress, the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) on whose subcommittee I am privileged to serve, held public hearings on legislation calling for the Government to pay 100 percent of employee health benefit premiums.

After considering these bills, the subcommittee noted:

Aside from the cost, were the Government to pay the total premium, employees would naturally choose the more expensive plans and options that provide the richest benefits, so that the only competition among health plans would be in the amount and kinds of benefits provided. Ultimately, every plan might be not only covering 100 percent of all medical expenses but exploring the inclusion of other types of related expenses.

I believe that this was a valid objection to the proposals that have been made in the past. However, my plan would meet this objection. It would set a limit on the types of coverage to which the Government would contribute, and it would retain the competition that now exists among the 36 different plans serving Federal employees.

Essentially, my plan would have the Government pay 100 percent of the cost of certain specified benefits which would be provided for all employees, annuitants and their families. In effect, this would become the low-option plan which each carrier would make available at no cost to the employee. Each carrier would then be free to offer such additional benefits as it chose, with the employee paying all of the additional cost.

The bill—H.R. 10593—which I am introducing today includes the following benefits for which the Government would pay the entire cost:

Up to 180 days' hospital coverage for each confinement;

Surgical benefits as outlined in the set schedule of fees with a maximum of \$500 for any one confinement.

Medical visits to be reimbursed at \$10 per hospital visit; \$8 per home visit; and \$6 per office visit;

Diagnostic services as provided for in a set schedule of fees;

First-aid treatment in full within 72 hours after an accident;

Maternity benefits to be treated as regular hospital benefits plus up to \$200 for doctor's charges;

Nursing care up to \$20 per 8-hour shift for up to 180 days a calendar year; Alcoholism and drug addiction for up to 30 days per calendar year;

Mental and nervous disorders for up to 30 days per calendar year;

Dental and cosmetic surgery shall be covered only when necessary for prompt repair of injury caused by an accident.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear at this point that there is certainly nothing sacred about these specific benefits that I have included in my bill. Further consideration may demonstrate that these benefits should be curtailed, eliminated, or expanded to include additional benefits. However, I do believe that this legislation is a necessary starting point which can be refined later on to establish the Federal Government as a model employer and to make Government service more attractive.

I am confident that the basic idea of this approach to providing health benefit coverage for Federal employees is sound. I feel it merits the prompt attention of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and, indeed, every Member of Congress.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION SUPPLYING ARMS TO JORDAN

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed last Friday by the report that the Nixon administration has approved the sale of \$30 million worth of arms and equipment to Jordan, including another squadron of F-104 jet interceptors.

It would appear that this administration intends to continue the already discredited policy of supplying arms to the so-called moderate Arab States in the hope of exercising some influence on these countries.

Has the administration forgotten that, in attacking Israel in June 1967, Jordan used arms and equipment, including tanks, provided by the United States?

The inclusion of a squadron of F-104 jet interceptors constitutes an especially grave threat to peace, for these jets will further bolster the increasing Arab military power and embolden their determination to destroy Israel.

We all know that Jordan has been a base for terroristic attacks on Israel which have continued unabated since the 6-day war. For what imaginable purpose would Jordan use these jets and other military equipment except to attack Israel?

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned by the fact that the Department of Defense is continuing to train Jordanian pilots and army personnel and other Arab pilots and army personnel in this country. The Department of Defense has advised me in a letter dated April 22 that 94 air force personnel and 74 army personnel from Jordan are being trained in U.S. service schools during fiscal year 1969. First we equip, and then we train, the Royal Jordanian Air Force.

No matter what the history of the Middle Eastern conflict demonstrates, the same stale policies continue to be implemented. The administration continues to arm Jordan in the face of every indication that these weapons will be used against Israel, to which we have a long-standing commitment. It should also be remembered that the vaunted "influence" which this policy was supposed to insure in the past was destroyed when King Hussein and other "moderate" Arab leaders placed their forces under the control of Nasser in the 6-day war. What is there to insure that these weapons will not become an addition to Nasser's developing stockpile of weapons again—to be used when the Arabs believe they have sufficient arms to finally annihilate Israel?

Has the U.S. Government learned nothing from the bloody and tragic war that took place less than 2 years ago?

I have called upon the President of the United States to rescind immediately the sale of these weapons to Jordan and to publicly disavow any intention of approving any further agreements which would subsidize the Arabs' hostile military intentions. My telegram of April 25 to the President follows: